

17845 East Highway 10 • P.O. Box 800 • Elk River, Minnesota 55330-0800 • 763-441-3121 • Fax 763-241-2366

June 22, 2005

The Honorable Kathleen D. Sheehy Administrative Law Judge Office of Administrative Hearings, Suite 1700 100 Washington Square Minneapolis, MN 55401-2138

Dear Judge Sheehy:

Re:

Revisions to Great River Energy's Certificate of Need Application.

Docket No. ET2/CN-05-347

On February 28, 2005 Great River Energy (GRE) filed its Certificate of Need Application for Great River Energy's Cambridge Station (Petition), Docket No. ET2/CN-05-347. On June 6, 2005, GRE submitted several revised sheets. Since the revision was submitted and at the request of the Department of Commerce, GRE updated Tables 3-3, 4-4, and 4-5 to reflect the final version of the fuel price forecasts contained in the EIA's 2005 Annual Energy Outlook. GRE originally used the early release version of this data, since the final version was not available at the time GRE filed its application.

Great River Energy submits the following revised sheets to its Petition, consistent with Minnesota Rules, part 7849.0200, subp. 3. GRE includes one set of sheets with the changed cells in the tables highlighted and another set that are clean copies of the changed pages. Also attached is an Affidavit of Service.

Once again the revisions have no effect on the proposed size, type, or timing of the proposed Cambridge Station nor do they change GRE's conclusion that the facility is necessary to meet forecasted load for the summer season of 2007.

Questions may be directed to me or to Michele Beck Jensen at 763-241-2398.

Sincerely

Vice President, Corporate Services

**Enclosures** 

s:\everyone\cert need 07 peaker\final documents\con revisions 2 cover letter.doc

#### AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

STATE OF MINNESOTA )
) ss
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN )

In Re: Comments of the Minnesota Department of Commerce

Docket No. ET2/CN-05-347

Lynn Safar, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and states that on the 22nd day of June, 2005, copies of the revised pages for the certificate of need application in the above referenced matter were hand delivered or mailed by United States first class mail, postage prepaid thereon, to the following:

Kathleen D. Sheehy Office of Administrative Hearings, Suite 1700 100 Washington Square Minneapolis, MN 55401-2138

Sharon Ferguson Minnesota Department of Commerce 85 Seventh Place East, Suite 500 St. Paul, MN 55101

Julia Anderson Attorney General's Office 1400 NCL Tower 445 Minnesota Street St. Paul, MN 55101-2131

Christopher Anderson Associate General Counsel Minnesota Power 30 West Superior Street Duluth, MN 55802-2093

Michael J. Bradley Moss & Barnett 4800 Wells Fargo Center 90 South 7<sup>th</sup> Street Minneapolis, MN 55402-4129 Dr. Burl W. Haar Executive Secretary Minnesota Public Utilities Commission 121 Seventh Place East, Suite 350 St. Paul, MN 55101

Curt Nelson Attorney General's Office-RUD 900 NCL Tower 445 Minnesota Street St. Paul, MN 55101-2130

Bill Storm Environmental Quality Board 300 Centennial Office Building 658 Cedar Street St. Paul, MN 55155

Karen Finstad Hammel Minnesota Office of the Attorney General 1400 NCL Tower 445 Minnesota Street St. Paul, MN 55101-2131

Dave Jacobson Minnesota Public Utilities Commission 121 Seventh Place East, Suite 350 St. Paul, MN 55101

### ET2/CN-05-347

In the Matter of Certificate of Need Application for GRE's Cambridge Station

1 Service List

Michele Beck Jensen Great River Energy 17845 East Highway 10 Elk River, MN 55330

Joseph Condo Calpine Corporation 250 Parkway Drive, Suite 380 Lincolnshire, IL 60069 Rick Lancaster Great River Energy 17845 East Highway 10 Elk River, MN 55330

B. Andrew Brown, Esq. Dorsey & Whitney, LLP 50 South Sixth Street, Suite 1500 Minneapolis, MN 55402

SWORN TO BEFORE ME this 22nd day of June, 2005

NOTARY PUBLIC

WENDY L. CASE
Notary Public
Mirroesota
My Commission Expires Jenusry 31, 2016

s:\everyone\cert need 07 peaker\service list and labels\affidavit of service.doc

Table 3-3 - Project Cost Analysis

ltem	Units	Project Data	Assumptions	MN Rule
Project Description				
Base Capability (Summer, site-specific rating)	MW	170	Manufacturer pro forma estimate	7849.025, A(1)
Cost Basis	Cal Yr	2004	The first term of the control of the	- Comment for Self
Life of Project	Years	30	Typical accounting life	7849.025, C(2)
Operating Cycle		Simple	THE PARTY OF A STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR	7849.025, A(2)
Annual Capacity Factor	%	9.6%	PVS experience	7849.025, A(2)
Annual Operating Time	Hours	840	Formula	
Average Annual Availability	%	97.5	PVS ops experience	7849.025, C(3)
Fuel Type		Nat Gas		7849.025, A(3)
Heat Input (HHV)	MMBtu/hr	1,756	Manufacturer pro forma estimate	et en
Heat Rate (HHV) - Summer Rating	Btu/kWh	10,330	Manufacturer pro forma estimate	7849.025, A(4)
Efficiency (HHV) - Summer Rating	%	33.0	Formula	7849.025, C(8)
Project Capital Cost	\$/kW	406	Overnight cost w/o IDC	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Fixed O&M Costs	\$/kW-yr	3.46	PVS experience	
Fuel Costs	\$/MMBtu	5.75	EIA 2005 AEO plus transport & balancing	7849.025, C(4)
Non-Fuel Variable O&M Costs	\$/MWh	8.41	Includes fired-hour costs & start charge	7849.025, C(5)
Capacity Costs (Fixed)				7849.025, C(1)
Total Project Capital Cost	\$	69,020,000	Formula	
Annual Fixed O&M	\$	588,200	Formula	
Total Annual Fixed Costs	\$	6,523,920	8.6% annual FCs + Fixed O&M	
Project Capacity Cost	\$/kW-yr	38.38	Formula	
Project Capacity Cost	\$/kWh	0.046	Formula	
Production Costs (Variable)				
Net Annual Generation	MWh	142,800	Formula	
Annual Fuel Consumption	MMBtu	1,475,124	Formula	
Annual Fuel Cost	\$	8,480,428	Formula	
Annual Non-Fuel Variable O&M Cost	\$	1,200,948	Formula	
Total Project Variable Generation Cost	\$	9,681,376	Formula	
Project Fuel Cost	\$/kWh	0.059	Formula	7849.025, C(4)
Project Total Energy Cost	\$/kWh	0.068	Formula	
Total Cost	\$/kWh	0,113	Formula	7849.025, C(6)

## 3.23 Use of Space

The project will be located on land that is currently used for utility operations. Adjacent property is used for agricultural and transportation purposes.

The project boundaries will utilize the parcel south of 349th Avenue NE for the CT, substation, water tanks and other balance of plant equipment. The parcel north of 349th Avenue NE will be utilized for shop space and parts storage.

# 4.5 Economic Comparisons to Proposed project

Table 4-4 provides the cost comparison between the project and the alternatives, which have met the initial screening criteria (oil-fired combustion turbine and the ethanol-fired combustion turbine). This table shows that the proposed project is clearly the lowest-cost alternative.

Table 4-4 - Comparison of Peaking Alternatives - Cost of Electricity

ltem	Units	Project	Oil-Fired Simple-Cycle	Ethanol-Fired Simple-Cycle	Assumptions	MN Rule
Project Description						
Base Capability (Summer, site-specific rating)	MW	170	164	164	Manufacturer pro forma estimate	7849.025, A(1)
Cost Basis	Cal Yr	2004	2004	2004	The state of the s	
Life of Project	Years	30	30	30	Typical accounting life	7849.025, C(2)
Operating Cycle		Simple	Simple	Simple	and the first of the second se	7849.025, A(2)
Annual Capacity Factor	%	9.6%	9.6%	9.6%	PVS experience	7849.025, A(2)
Annual Operating Time	Hours	840	840	840	Formula	er er er er ett er mede ensemmeliken die e
Average Annual Availability	%	97.5	97.5	97.5	PVS ops experience	7849.025, C(3)
Fuel Type		Nat Gas	No. 2 Fuel Oil	Ethanol	the state of the s	7849.025, A(3)
Heat Input (HHV)	MMBtu/hr	1,756	1,714	1,714	PVS ops experience	
Heat Rate (HHV) - Summer Rating	Btu/kWh	10,330	10,450	10,450	PVS ops experience	7849.025, A(4)
Efficiency (HHV) - Summer Rating	%	33.0	32.7	32.7	Formula	7849.025, C(8)
Project Capital Cost	\$/kW	406	430	443	Overnight cost w/o IDC	
Fixed O&M Costs	\$/kW-yr	3.46	3.46	3.46	PVS experience	
Fuel Costs	\$/MMBtu	5.75	6.53	19.45	EIA 2005 AEO plus transport & balancing	7849.025, C(4)
Non-Fuel Variable O&M Costs	\$/MWh	8.41	12.62	12.62	Includes fired-hour costs & start charge	7849.025, C(5)
Capacity Costs (Fixed)					BUNGAN BUNGSALAN KECAT	7849.025, C(1)
Total Project Capital Cost	\$	69,020,000	70,520,000	72,652,000	Formula	, 0 10.020, 0(1)
Annual Fixed O&M	\$	588,200	567,440	567,440	Formula	ment of a second of the second of
Total Annual Fixed Costs	\$	6,523,920	6,632,160	6.815.512	8.6% annual FCs + Fixed O&M	
Project Capacity Cost	\$/kW-yr	38.38	40.44	41.56	Formula	and the first considerable of the second control of
Project Capacity Cost	\$/kWh	0.046	0.048	0.049	Formula	The contration of the contrati
Production Costs (Variable)	126. YARA				######################################	
Net Annual Generation	MWh	142,800	137,760	137,760	Formula	n sprikova klasti
Annual Fuel Consumption	MMBtu	1,475,124	1,439,760	1,439,760	Formula	en e
Annual Fuel Cost	\$	8,480,428	9,398,831	28,003,332	Formula	
Annual Non-Fuel Variable O&M Cost	\$	1,200,948	1,738,531	1,738,531	Formula	remain methodologic football (so to consider
Total Project Variable Generation Cost	\$	9,681,376	11,137,362	29,741,863	Formula	each time and Marcelland, and a source from a way of the source
Project Fuel Cost	\$/kWh	0.059	0.068	0.203	Formula	7849.025, C(4)
Project Total Energy Cost	\$/kWh	0.068	0.081	0.216	Formula	
Total Cost	\$/kWh	0.113	0.129	0.265	Formula	7849.025, C(6)

As for the biomass alternative analyzed, the table shows that substantial reductions in the cost of ethanol would be needed in order for such an alternative to be competitive with the project. Therefore, an ethanol-fueled peaker is not a reasonable alternative

Table 4-5 below demonstrates the relative annual revenue requirement (\$/MWh) for the three projects examined in depth in Table 4-3 and 4-4. This includes the proposed project as well as two alternatives.

### Table 4-5 – Comparison of Peaking Alternatives - Rate Impact

**TRADE SECRET INFORMATION BEGINS** 

TRADE SECRET INFORMATION ENDS]

## 4.6 Conclusion

GRE has examined alternatives to the proposed project. Based on the primary objectives, there are no reasonable alternatives that are available in the necessary timeframe that would reliably and economically meet GRE's peaking resource needs.

Table 3-3 - Project Cost Analysis

Project Description Base Capability (Summer, site-specific rating) Cost Basis	MW	and the second distriction of		***********
Cost Basis			ESSENTIMENTO DE LA CASTA DEL CAS	en december
		170	Manufacturer pro forma estimate	7849.025, A(1)
	Cal Yr	2004		
Life of Project	Years	30	Typical accounting life	7849.025, C(2)
Operating Cycle		Simple		7849.025, A(2)
Annual Capacity Factor	%	9.6%	PVS experience	7849.025, A(2)
Annual Operating Time	Hours	840	Formula	
Average Annual Availability	%	97.5	PVS ops experience	7849.025, C(3)
Fuel Type		Nat Gas		7849.025, A(3)
Heat Input (HHV)	MMBtu/hr	1,756	Manufacturer pro forma estimate	
Heat Rate (HHV) - Summer Rating	Btu/kWh	10,330	Manufacturer pro forma estimate	7849.025, A(4)
Efficiency (HHV) - Summer Rating	%	33.0	Formula	7849.025, C(8)
Project Capital Cost	\$/kW	406	Overnight cost w/o IDC	
Fixed O&M Costs	\$/kW-yr	3.46	PVS experience	
Fuel Costs	\$/MMBtu	5,75	EIA 2005 AEO plus transport & balancing	7849.025, C(4)
Non-Fuel Variable O&M Costs	\$/MWh	8.41	Includes fired-hour costs & start charge	7849.025, C(5)
Capacity Costs (Fixed)	a Arabbis sarah	TOTAL SECTION		7849.025, C(1)
Total Project Capital Cost	\$	69,020,000	Formula	
Annual Fixed O&M	\$	588,200	Formula	
Total Annual Fixed Costs	\$	6,523,920	8.6% annual FCs + Fixed O&M	
Project Capacity Cost	\$/kW-yr	38.38	Formula	
Project Capacity Cost	\$/kWh	0.046	Formula	
Production Costs (Variable)	and the ball that	arserellezithises	as autenminikana sanan eses eses eses es	proteines as an in
Net Annual Generation	MWh	142,800	Formula	
Annual Fuel Consumption	MMBtu	1,475,124	Formula	
Annual Fuel Cost	\$	8,480,428	Formula	
Annual Non-Fuel Variable O&M Cost	\$	1,200,948	Formula	
Total Project Variable Generation Cost	\$	9,681,376	Formula	
Project Fuel Cost	\$/kWh	0.059	Formula	7849.025, C(4)
Project Total Energy Cost	\$/kWh	0,068	Formula	***************************************

## 3.23 Use of Space

The project will be located on land that is currently used for utility operations. Adjacent property is used for agricultural and transportation purposes.

The project boundaries will utilize the parcel south of 349th Avenue NE for the CT, substation, water tanks and other balance of plant equipment. The parcel north of 349th Avenue NE will be utilized for shop space and parts storage.

## 4.5 Economic Comparisons to Proposed project

Table 4-4 provides the cost comparison between the project and the alternatives, which have met the initial screening criteria (oil-fired combustion turbine and the ethanol-fired combustion turbine). This table shows that the proposed project is clearly the lowest-cost alternative.

Table 4-4 - Comparison of Peaking Alternatives - Cost of Electricity

Item	Units	Project	Oil-Fired Simple-Cycle	Ethanol-Fired Simple-Cycle	Assumptions	MN Rule
Project Description	oca a <b>respons</b> a (sa)	is terminal states the	n com management	nasconi carabanta pera	o establica de Rica de Charles (1886) (1886)	No lineare assis
Base Capability (Summer, site-specific rating)	MW	170	164	164	Manufacturer pro forma estimate	7849.025, A(1)
Cost Basis	Cal Yr	2004	2004	2004		
Life of Project	Years	30	30	30	Typical accounting life	7849.025, C(2)
Operating Cycle		Simple	Simple	Simple		7849.025, A(2)
Annual Capacity Factor	%	9.6%	9.6%	9.6%	PVS experience	7849.025, A(2)
Annual Operating Time	Hours	840	840	840	Formula	
Average Annual Availability	%	97.5	97.5	97.5	PVS ops experience	7849.025, C(3)
Fuel Type		Nat Gas	No. 2 Fuel Oil	Ethanol		7849.025, A(3)
Heat Input (HHV)	MMBtu/hr	1,756	1,714	1,714	PVS ops experience	
Heat Rate (HHV) - Summer Rating	Btu/kWh	10,330	10,450	10,450	PVS ops experience	7849.025, A(4)
Efficiency (HHV) - Summer Rating	%	33.0	32.7	32.7	Formula	7849.025, C(8)
Project Capital Cost	\$/kW	406	430	443	Overnight cost w/o IDC	***************************************
Fixed O&M Costs	\$/kW-yr	3.46	3,46	3.46	PVS experience	
Fuel Costs	\$/MMBtu	5.75	6.53	19.45	EIA 2005 AEO plus transport & balancing	7849.025, C(4)
Non-Fuel Variable O&M Costs	\$/MWh	8.41	12.62	12.62	Includes fired-hour costs & start charge	7849.025, C(5)
Capacity Costs (Fixed)					and control of the second section is a second	7849.025, C(1)
Total Project Capital Cost	S	69.020.000	70.520.000	72.652.000	Formula	
Annual Fixed O&M	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	588,200	567,440	567.440	Formula	
Total Annual Fixed Costs	Š	6.523.920	6.632.160	6.815.512	8.6% annual FCs + Fixed O&M	
Project Capacity Cost	\$/kW-yr	38.38	40.44	41.56	Formula	·····
Project Capacity Cost	\$/kWh	0.046	0.048	0.049	Formula	
Production Costs (Variable)					10 mm	
Net Annual Generation	MWh	142.800	137.760	137.760	Formula	
Annual Fuel Consumption	MMBtu	1.475.124	1.439.760	1.439.760	Formula	
Annual Fuel Cost	S	8,480,428	9,398,831	28,003,332	Formula	
Annual Non-Fuel Variable O&M Cost	\$	1,200,948	1,738,531	1,738,531	Formula	***************************************
Total Project Variable Generation Cost	\$	9,681,376	11,137,362	29,741,863	Formula	
Project Fuel Cost	\$/kWh	0.059	0.068	0.203	Formula	7849.025, C(4)
Project Total Energy Cost	\$/kWh	0.068	0.081	0.216	Formula	
Total Cost	\$/kWh	0.113	0.129	0.265	Formula	7849.025, C(6)

As for the biomass alternative analyzed, the table shows that substantial reductions in the cost of ethanol would be needed in order for such an alternative to be competitive with the project. Therefore, an ethanol-fueled peaker is not a reasonable alternative

Table 4-5 below demonstrates the relative annual revenue requirement (\$/MWh) for the three projects examined in depth in Table 4-3 and 4-4. This includes the proposed project as well as two alternatives.

### Table 4-5 - Comparison of Peaking Alternatives - Rate Impact

[TRADE SECRET INFORMATION BEGINS

TRADE SECRET INFORMATION ENDS]

### 4.6 Conclusion

GRE has examined alternatives to the proposed project. Based on the primary objectives, there are no reasonable alternatives that are available in the necessary timeframe that would reliably and economically meet GRE's peaking resource needs.